

Rational solutions to d-P_{IV}

Jarmo Hietarinta^{1,2*} and Kenji Kajiwara^{2†}

¹Department of Physics, University of Turku
FIN-20014 Turku, Finland

²Department of Electrical Engineering
Doshisha University, Tanabe, Kyoto 610-03, Japan

Abstract

We study the rational solutions of the discrete version of Painlevé's fourth equation (d-P_{IV}). The solutions are generated by applying Schlesinger transformations on the seed solutions $-2z$ and $-1/z$. After studying the structure of these solutions we are able to write them in a determinantal form that includes an interesting parameter shift that vanishes in the continuous limit.

1 Introduction

One important question in the study of discrete versions of continuous differential equations concerns the existence of corresponding special solutions. For continuous Painlevé equations rational and special function solutions are known [1, 2], and in many cases even a rigorous classification has been done [3]. If one proposes a discrete version of a Painlevé equation it is not enough that in some continuous limit the continuous Painlevé equation is obtained, but in addition the proposed equation should share some further properties of the original equation. One of these properties should be the equivalent of the Painlevé property, called “singularity confinement” [4]. This has already been used to propose discrete forms of the Painlevé equations [5]. Other structures of the continuous Painlevé equations that have been shown to exist for the discrete ones include their relationships by coalescence limits [6] and the existence of Hirota forms [7] for these equations. What is still largely an open question is the fate of the special solutions (rational, algebraic, special function) known for the continuous case.

*E-mail: hietarin@newton.tfy.utu.fi

†E-mail: kaji@elrond.doshisha.ac.jp

Here we discuss the determinantal structure of the *rational solutions* to the discrete fourth Painlevé equation, (d-P_{IV}), given by [5]

$$(x_{n+1} + x_n)(x_n + x_{n-1}) = \frac{(x_n + \alpha + \beta)(x_n + \alpha - \beta)(x_n - \alpha + \beta)(x_n - \alpha - \beta)}{(x_n + z_n + \gamma)(x_n + z_n - \gamma)} \quad (1)$$

where $z_n = \delta n + \zeta$. [Note that this equation is invariant under the change sign of any of parameters α, β, γ .]

One reason for calling (1) d-P_{IV} is that if we put $\alpha^2 = -a + \sqrt{-b/2} + \delta^{-2}$, $\beta^2 = -a - \sqrt{-b/2} + \delta^{-2}$, $\gamma = \delta^{-1}$ and then take the limit $\delta \rightarrow 0$ we get P_{IV}:

$$\frac{d^2 w}{dz^2} = \frac{1}{2w} \left(\frac{dw}{dz} \right)^2 + \frac{3}{2} w^3 + 4zw^2 + 2(z^2 - a)w + \frac{b}{w}. \quad (2)$$

The comparison of (1) and (2) reveals the first interesting difference between the discrete and continuous versions: the discrete one has more parameters.

But why should one insist on writing the solution in determinantal form? It is well known that most integrable systems have multisoliton (and rational) solutions in determinantal form, and the same holds for many special solutions of continuous Painlevé equations. This determinantal structure actually carries fundamental information and reveals the “basic” object hidden in the solutions. For example it is well known that P_{II},

$$\frac{d^2 u}{dz^2} = 2u^3 - 4zu + 4\alpha, \quad (3)$$

where α is a parameter, admits rational solutions for $\alpha = N + 1$. It has also been shown that these solutions can be expressed as [8]

$$u = \frac{d}{dz} \log \frac{\tau_{N+1}}{\tau_N}, \quad (4)$$

where τ_N 's are polynomials in z (Vorob'ev–Yablonski polynomials). However, it has been shown only recently that τ_N can be expressed in determinantal form [9],

$$\tau_N = \begin{vmatrix} q_N(z, t) & q_{N+1}(z, t) & \cdots & q_{2N-1}(z, t) \\ q_{N-2}(z, t) & q_{N-1}(z, t) & \cdots & q_{2N-3}(z, t) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_{-N+2}(z, t) & q_{-N+3}(z, t) & \cdots & q_1(z, t) \end{vmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

where q_k 's are the so called Devisme polynomials defined by

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q_k(z, t) \lambda^k = \exp \left(z\lambda + t\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{3}\lambda^3 \right), \quad \text{and} \quad q_k(z, t) = 0, \quad \text{for } k < 0. \quad (6)$$

Thus, these Devisme polynomials may be considered as basic polynomials in the rational solutions of P_{II} . Similar determinantal structure of the rational solutions is observed for the discrete case: in fact, it has been shown that in the case of $d\text{-}P_{II}$, the rational solutions can be expressed by determinants whose entries are given by Laguerre polynomials [10, 11].

In the case of P_{IV} , it is well known [1] that the continuous P_{IV} has three rational solution hierarchies, whose “seed” solutions are

$$y(z) = -2z, \quad -\frac{1}{z}, \quad \text{or} \quad -\frac{2}{3}z, \quad (7)$$

and determinantal forms of the first two hierarchies have been discussed in general terms, e.g., in [2]. The detailed results for the first two hierarchies are as follows [12]. Let τ_N^ν be an $N \times N$ determinant of Hankel type given by

$$\tau_N^\nu = \det |H_{\nu+i+j-2}|_{1 \leq i, j \leq N}, \quad \tau_0^\nu = 1, \quad (8)$$

where H_n , $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ are Hermite polynomials in x characterized by the recursion relations

$$H_{n+1} = xH_n - nH_{n-1}, \quad \frac{d}{dx}H_n = nH_{n-1}, \quad H_0 = 1, \quad H_1 = x. \quad (9)$$

Then

$$w = -\sqrt{2} \frac{d}{dx} \log \left(\frac{\tau_{N+1}^\nu}{\tau_N^\nu} \right), \quad z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x, \quad (10)$$

are rational solutions of $P_{IV}(2)$ for parameter values

$$(a, b) = (-(\nu + 2N + 1), -2\nu^2), \quad \nu, N \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad \nu \geq 1, \quad N \geq 0. \quad (11)$$

Moreover,

$$w = \sqrt{2} \left(\frac{d}{dx} \log \left(\frac{\tau_{N+1}^\nu}{\tau_N^{\nu+1}} \right) - x \right), \quad z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}x, \quad (12)$$

yield rational solutions of $P_{IV}(2)$ with

$$(a, b) = (N - \nu, -2(\nu + N + 1)^2), \quad \nu, N \in \mathcal{Z}, \quad \nu \geq 0, \quad N \geq 0. \quad (13)$$

The solutions given in (10) and (12) correspond to the “ $-1/z$ ” and “ $-2z$ ” hierarchies, respectively¹.

Here our object is to find the discrete versions of these results for the $-2z$ and $-1/z$ hierarchies. (We hope to return the more complicated $-\frac{2}{3}z$ case elsewhere.) We cannot simply discretize the continuous results, because

¹ Equations (10) and (12) actually give half of the solutions in $-1/z$ and $-2z$ hierarchies obtained by Murata [3]. The other half is given in terms of polynomials similar to the Hermite polynomials, but with some different signs in the recursion relations above.

the discrete equation has more parameters, and the way the new parameters modify the continuous results is indeed one of the interesting questions. In approaching this problem we will not use any detailed properties of the continuous case, we just assume that such rational solutions should arise from determinants of polynomials, which always happens in the continuous case. Starting with the discrete version of the usual seed solutions, we first construct a set of solutions in both hierarchies using Bäcklund–Schlesinger transformations (discussed in the next section) and then search for the determinantal structure by studying the properties of these rational solutions, the main clue being the factorization of the denominator.

2 Bäcklund–Schlesinger transformation

In order to generate rational solutions we use the Bäcklund–Schlesinger transformations on the seed solutions. These transformations were given in [13]. We write them as follows:

Bäcklund transformation: Let us assume that $x(n)$ solves d-P_{IV} with parameter values (α, β, γ) (in which case we often write $x = x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma)$ or $x = \{f(n); \alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$). Using these let us define

$$BT_{a,b}(x) := \left[\frac{x\bar{x} + \bar{x}(\tilde{z} + a) + x(\tilde{z} - a) + b^2 - a^2}{x + \bar{x}} \right]_{n \rightarrow n + \frac{1}{2}} \quad (14)$$

where $\tilde{z} = (n + \frac{1}{2})\delta + \zeta$, and $\bar{x} = x(n + 1)$. Note the shifts in n . Then we get new solutions from the elementary Bäcklund transformations BT_i as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} x(n; \alpha + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma, \beta) &= BT_1 x(n) = BT_{\alpha, \beta}(x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma), \\ x(n; \alpha - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma, \beta) &= BT_2 x(n) = BT_{-\alpha, \beta}(x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma), \\ x(n; \beta + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma, \alpha) &= BT_3 x(n) = BT_{\beta, \alpha}(x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma), \\ x(n; \beta - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma, \alpha) &= BT_4 x(n) = BT_{-\beta, \alpha}(x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

These transformations jump too much in the parameter space and therefore it is useful to define **Schlesinger transformations** that generate new solutions by changing only one of the parameters

$$\begin{aligned} x(n; \alpha + \delta, \beta, \gamma) &= S_1(x) = BT_1 BT_1 x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma), \\ x(n; \alpha - \delta, \beta, \gamma) &= S_2(x) = BT_2 BT_2 x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma), \\ x(n; \alpha, \beta + \delta, \gamma) &= S_3(x) = BT_2 BT_3 BT_1 BT_3 x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma), \\ x(n; \alpha, \beta - \delta, \gamma) &= S_3(x) = BT_2 BT_3 BT_2 BT_4 x(n; \alpha, \beta, \gamma). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

It should be noted that sometimes there are barriers over which Schlesinger transformations cannot cross. For example if $\alpha = \gamma + (m + \frac{1}{2})\delta$ and $\beta = \gamma - (n + \frac{1}{2})\delta$ (which is relevant for some rational hierarchies) then the barrier $n = 0$ cannot be crossed by Schlesinger transformations because BT_3 yields the 0 solution, similarly for $m = 0$ with BT_2 .

3 Some solutions

Using the above Schlesinger transformations we can construct other rational solutions from the seed solutions. The seed for the $-2z$ hierarchy is given by

$$x_{00} = \{-2z, \gamma + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma\}. \quad (17)$$

(here and in the following $z = n\delta + \zeta$.) Since equation (1) is invariant under the sign changes in α , β and γ we may always assume the above signs in front of γ . With Schlesinger transformations we can reach the parameter values

$$\alpha = \gamma + (M + \tfrac{1}{2})\delta, \quad \beta = \gamma - (N + \tfrac{1}{2})\delta, \quad (18)$$

where M and N are nonnegative integers, and we may also assume that $M \geq N$ because of the $\alpha \leftrightarrow \beta$ symmetry. This then defines the extent of the hierarchy. For particular solutions we give N, M as subscripts. Some further solutions obtained this way are (see also [14])

$$\begin{aligned} x_{10} &= \left\{ \frac{-2z^2 + \delta(\gamma + \delta)}{z}, \gamma + \tfrac{3}{2}\delta, \gamma - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}, \\ x_{20} &= \left\{ \frac{4z^3 + 2z\delta(-3\gamma - 5\delta)}{-2z^2 + \delta(\gamma + 2\delta)}, \gamma + \tfrac{5}{2}\delta, \gamma - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}, \\ x_{30} &= \left\{ \frac{4z^4 + 4z^2\delta(-3\gamma - 7\delta) + 3\delta^2(\gamma^2 + 5\gamma\delta + 6\delta^2)}{-2z^3 + z\delta(3\gamma + 8\delta)}, \gamma + \tfrac{7}{2}\delta, \gamma - \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}, \\ x_{31} &= \left\{ \frac{8z^5 - 16z^3\delta^2 + 2z\delta^2(3\gamma^2 + \delta^2)}{-4z^4 + 4z^2\delta^2 + \delta^2(\gamma^2 - \delta^2)}, \gamma + \tfrac{3}{2}\delta, \gamma - \tfrac{3}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The $-1/z$ -hierarchy is not connected to the $-2z$ hierarchy by a Schlesinger transformation, but only by a Bäcklund transformation followed by a redefinition of γ . In any case the seed is

$$x_{10} = \left\{ \frac{-\delta(\gamma + \delta)}{z}, \gamma + \tfrac{3}{2}\delta, \gamma + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta \right\}, \quad (19)$$

and in general the parameter values in this hierarchy are

$$\alpha = \gamma + (M + \tfrac{1}{2})\delta, \quad \beta = \gamma + (N + \tfrac{1}{2})\delta, \quad (20)$$

with $0 \leq N < M$. Some further solutions are given by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{20} &= \left\{ \frac{2z\delta(2\gamma + 3\delta)}{-2z^2 + \delta(\gamma + 2\delta)}, \gamma + \tfrac{5}{2}\delta, \gamma + \tfrac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}, \\ x_{21} &= \left\{ \frac{\delta(\gamma + 2\delta)(-2z^2 + \delta(\gamma + \delta))}{2z^3 + z\delta\gamma}, \gamma + \tfrac{5}{2}\delta, \gamma + \tfrac{3}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

			0	$\frac{[6]}{[3][4]}$	3	$\gamma + \frac{7}{2}\delta$
$-1/z$		0	$\frac{[4]}{[3][2]}$	$\frac{[9]}{[4][6]}$	2	$\gamma + \frac{5}{2}\delta$
	0	$\frac{[2]}{[1][2]}$	$\frac{[5]}{[2][4]}$	$\frac{[8]}{[3][6]}$	1	$\gamma + \frac{3}{2}\delta$
	0	$\frac{[0]}{[0][1]}$	$\frac{[1]}{[0][2]}$	$\frac{[2]}{[0][3]}$	0	$\gamma + \frac{1}{2}\delta$
$M =$	0	1	2	3	4	
$\alpha =$	$\gamma + \frac{1}{2}\delta$	$\gamma + \frac{3}{2}\delta$	$\gamma + \frac{5}{2}\delta$	$\gamma + \frac{7}{2}\delta$	$\gamma + \frac{9}{2}\delta$	N
						β
	0	$\frac{[0]}{[0][1]}$	$\frac{[1]}{[0][2]}$	$\frac{[2]}{[0][3]}$	$\frac{[3]}{[0][4]}$	0
		$\frac{[3]}{[2][2]}$	$\frac{[6]}{[3][4]}$	$\frac{[9]}{[4][6]}$	$\frac{[12]}{[5][8]}$	1
$-2z$			$\frac{[11]}{[6][6]}$	$\frac{[16]}{[9][8]}$		2
				$\frac{[23]}{[12][12]}$		3
						$\gamma - \frac{1}{2}\delta$
						$\gamma - \frac{3}{2}\delta$
						$\gamma - \frac{5}{2}\delta$
						$\gamma - \frac{7}{2}\delta$

Figure 1: Observed degrees in n (in square brackets) of various solutions. The denominator always factorizes. For the $-2z$ hierarchy we have subtracted $-2z$ from each solution.

$$\begin{aligned}
x_{30} &= \left\{ \frac{3\delta(-\gamma - 2\delta)(-2z^2 + \delta(\gamma + 3\delta))}{-2z^3 + z\delta(3\gamma + 8\delta)}, \gamma + \frac{7}{2}\delta, \gamma + \frac{1}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}, \\
x_{32} &= \left\{ \frac{(-\gamma - 3\delta)\delta(4z^4 - 4z^2\delta^2 + 3\delta^2(\gamma^2 + 2\gamma\delta + \delta^2))}{4z^5 + 4z^3\delta(2\gamma + \delta) + z\delta^2(3\gamma^2 + 4\gamma\delta + \delta^2)}, \gamma + \frac{7}{2}\delta, \gamma + \frac{5}{2}\delta, \gamma \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

It is obvious from these examples (and from the equation) that there is an overall scaling invariance, and because of this we will in the following simplify expressions by scaling out δ by writing $\gamma = c\delta$, $z = n\delta$.

4 The elementary polynomials

A common property for rational and other special function solutions of the continuous case is that the denominator factorizes into two determinants. Thus after constructing a set of solutions (all computations were done using REDUCE [15]) we studied the factorization of their denominators, the results are given in Figure 1. From it we can see that for the $-2z$ hierarchy the denominators of x_{MN} factorize with factors of degree $N(M+1)$ and $(N+1)M$ in n , and for the $-1/z$ hierarchy the degrees are $N(M-N)$ and $(N+1)(M-N)$.

Next observe that when $N = 0$ one of the factors in the denominator is constant and the other grows *linearly* with M . (For this value $N = 0$ the denominators are the same for the $-2z$ and $-1/z$ hierarchies.) The denominator is interpreted as the product of an 0×0 and 1×1 matrix, and this suggests that the denominators can provide us the basic polynomials that are to be used as matrix elements. The first few polynomials obtained this way are (when normalized to be monic):

$$\begin{aligned}
p_0(n, c) &:= 1, \\
p_1(n, c) &:= n, \\
p_2(n, c) &:= n^2 - \frac{1}{2}c - 1, \\
p_3(n, c) &:= n^3 + n(-\frac{3}{2}c - 4), \\
p_4(n, c) &:= n^4 + n^2(-3c - 10) + \frac{3}{4}c^2 + \frac{21}{4}c + 9, \\
p_5(n, c) &:= n^5 + 5n^3(-c - 4) + n(\frac{15}{4}c^2 + \frac{125}{4}c + 64), \\
p_6(n, c) &:= n^6 + n^4(-\frac{15}{2}c - 35) + n^2(\frac{45}{4}c^2 + \frac{435}{4}c + 259) \\
&\quad - \frac{15}{8}c^3 - \frac{225}{8}c^2 - \frac{555}{4}c - 225, \\
p_7(n, c) &:= n^7 + n^5(-\frac{21}{2}c - 56) + n^3(\frac{105}{4}c^2 + \frac{1155}{4}c + 784) \\
&\quad + n(-\frac{105}{8}c^3 - \frac{1785}{8}c^2 - \frac{2499}{2}c - 2304)
\end{aligned}$$

One indication that we are on the right track is obtained when we observe that the $p_N(n, c)$ satisfy recursion relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
p_{N+1}(n, c) &= n p_N(n, c) - \frac{N}{2}(c + N + 1) p_{N-1}(n, c + 1), \\
p_N(n + \frac{1}{2}, c) - p_N(n - \frac{1}{2}, c) &= N p_{N-1}(n, c + \frac{1}{2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

As was noted in Sec. 1 the matrix elements of the corresponding continuous case are given in terms of Hermite polynomials. Now we note that in the continuous limit (which means $n = x/(\sqrt{2}\delta)$, $c = 1/\delta^2$, $\delta \rightarrow 0$) we get for

$$H_N(x) := \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} (\sqrt{2}\delta)^N p_N(x/(\sqrt{2}\delta), 1/\delta^2), \tag{22}$$

the recursions relations of Hermite polynomials (9).

5 Matrix form of the denominators

The above indicates what the polynomial matrix entries should be, and determining the structure of these matrices in the denominator is the next problem.

For $N = 0$ the denominator was interpreted as the product of an 0×0 and 1×1 matrix. For $N = 1$ we can see from the table that one of the factors grows by 1 as M increases by 1 and the other factor increases by 2.

These factors were interpreted as 1×1 and 2×2 matrices, respectively. The 1×1 part for $N = 1$ was then found to be proportional to the *shifted* basic polynomials given above: for a given M this factor is $p_{M+1}(c-1)$ in the $-2z$ hierarchy and $p_{M+1}(c+1)$ in the $-1/z$ hierarchy. The necessity of shifts in c is an important new ingredient, and something that exists only in the discrete version.

The next problem was to find a suitable matrix structure for the factors of the denominator. Our working assumption was that for any M the denominator should be a product of a $N \times N$ and a $(N+1) \times (N+1)$ matrix. The degrees of these factors led us to try the determinantal structure of Hankel type

$$T_{L,K} := \begin{vmatrix} q_K & q_{K+1} & \cdots & q_{K+L-1} \\ q_{K+1} & q_{K+2} & \cdots & q_{K+L} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_{K+L-1} & q_{K+L} & \cdots & q_{K+2L-2} \end{vmatrix},$$

because now if the entries q_K are non-monic polynomials of degree K then $\deg(T_{L,K}) = L(K+L-1)$.

A more detailed study with some trial and error revealed that q 's are not simply proportional to the p 's obtained before, but that different shifts in c are also needed for the matrix elements. Our final result is as follows:

For the $-2z$ hierarchy (for which $\alpha = \gamma + (M + \frac{1}{2})\delta$, $\beta = \gamma - (N + \frac{1}{2})\delta$ where $0 \leq N \leq M$) the denominator can be expressed as

$$\text{den}(x_{M,N}) = \tau_{N,M-N+2}(-1) \tau_{N+1,M-N}(0), \quad (23)$$

where

$$\tau_{L,K}(s) := \begin{vmatrix} q_K(s) & q_{K+1}(s) & \cdots & q_{K+L-1}(s) \\ q_{K+1}(s-1) & q_{K+2}(s-1) & \cdots & q_{K+L}(s-1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ q_{K+L-1}(s-L+1) & q_{K+L}(s-L+1) & \cdots & q_{K+2L-2}(s-L+1) \end{vmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

and

$$q_M(s) := (c+s)^M p_M(c+s)/M!. \quad (25)$$

For the $-1/z$ hierarchy ($\alpha = \gamma + (M + \frac{1}{2})\delta$, $\beta = \gamma + (N + \frac{1}{2})\delta$, where $0 \leq N < M$) we found same matrix form, but with different degrees and shifts:

$$\text{den}(x_{M,N}) = \tau_{N,M-2N+1}(N) \tau_{N+1,M-2N}(N). \quad (26)$$

6 The numerator

Finding a determinantal form for the numerator was more difficult, because it did not factorize. However this was expected, because usually it turns out that the numerator is the sum of two products of τ -functions, c.f., (4,10,12).

Thus we tried to express the numerator as a sum of two products of two τ -functions (24), with possible shifts not only in c , but also in n , corresponding to the derivatives in the continuous cases. Furthermore it seemed reasonable to assume that the sizes of the matrices were the same as in the denominators, and that the other index of the τ -function depended linearly on M and N . Figuring out the shifts in n required some more trial and error, but eventually we arrived at the result that worked:

For the $-2z$ hierarchy we got

$$x(n; \gamma + (M + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma - (N + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma) \propto \frac{\cosh(\frac{1}{2}D_n) \tau_{N, M-N+1}(-\frac{1}{2}) \cdot \tau_{N+1, M-N+1}(-\frac{1}{2})}{\tau_{N, M-N+2}(-1) \tau_{N+1, M-N}(0)}, \quad (27)$$

and the corresponding result for the $-1/z$ hierarchy was

$$x(n; \gamma + (M + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma + (N + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma) \propto \frac{\sinh(\frac{1}{2}D_n) \tau_{N, M-2N+1}(N - \frac{1}{2}) \cdot \tau_{N+1, M-2N}(N + \frac{1}{2})}{\tau_{N, M-2N+1}(N) \tau_{N+1, M-2N}(N)}. \quad (28)$$

In expressing the n -shifts we have used the usual Hirota bilinear derivative operator D_n . These results look a bit more symmetrical if we define $\bar{\tau}_{N, A+B+N-1}(2B - N + 1) := \tau_{N, A}(B)$, then we get

$$x(n; \gamma + (M + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma - (N + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma) \propto \frac{\cosh(\frac{1}{2}D_n) \bar{\tau}_{N, M-\frac{1}{2}}(-N) \cdot \bar{\tau}_{N+1, M+\frac{1}{2}}(-N-1)}{\bar{\tau}_{N, M}(-N-1) \bar{\tau}_{N+1, M}(-N)}, \quad (29)$$

and

$$x(n; \gamma + (M + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma + (N + \frac{1}{2})\delta, \gamma) \propto \frac{\sinh(\frac{1}{2}D_n) \bar{\tau}_{N, M-\frac{1}{2}}(N) \cdot \bar{\tau}_{N+1, M+\frac{1}{2}}(N+1)}{\bar{\tau}_{N, M}(N+1) \bar{\tau}_{N+1, M}(N)}. \quad (30)$$

7 Conclusions

We have shown here that the two hierarchies of rational solutions for d-P_{IV} (generated from $-2z$ and $-1/z$) can be expressed in terms of determinants, and that the matrix elements of these determinants are given by polynomials that can be regarded as discrete analogues of Hermite polynomials. It is interesting that in these expressions the parameter c , which vanishes in the continuous limit, plays an important role. However, the result is not yet complete, because the bilinear equation for the τ -function is still to be written, and the general proof must be given.

For the $-\frac{2}{3}z$ hierarchy things are an order of magnitude more difficult. There is no linear growth in any direction in the parameter space so there are no candidates for matrix elements. We have nevertheless found what the τ -functions should be, but no determinantal expression for them. Although no determinantal expression or basic polynomial is known even in the continuous case, we hope that similar structures in solutions of both continuous and discrete cases will be found.

Acknowledgments

One of the authors (K.K) was supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Encouragement of Young Scientists from The Ministry of Education, Science, Sports and Culture of Japan, No.08750090. This work was started when J.H. was visiting Doshisha University on an exchange grant between the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science and the Academy of Finland.

References

- [1] N. Lukashevich, Diff. Urav. **1**, 731 (1965). [Diff. Eqs. **1**, 561 (1965).]
N. Lukashevich, Diff. Urav. **3**, 771 (1967). [Diff. Eqs. **3**, 395 (1967).]
V.I. Gromak, Diff. Urav. **23**, 760 (1987). [Diff. Eqs. **23**, 506 (1987).]
- [2] K. Okamoto, Math. Ann. **275**, 221 (1986).
- [3] Y. Murata, Funkcial. Ekvac., **28**, 1 (1985).
- [4] B. Grammaticos, A. Ramani and V. Papageorgiou, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1825 (1991).
- [5] A. Ramani, B. Grammaticos and J. Hietarinta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1829 (1991).
- [6] A. Ramani and B. Grammaticos, Physica **A 228**, 160 (1996).

- [7] A. Ramani, B. Grammaticos and J. Satsuma: J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **28**, 4655 (1995).
- [8] A.P. Vorob'ev, Diff. Urav. **1**, 79 (1965). [Diff. Eqs. **1**, 58 (1965).]
- [9] K. Kajiwara and Y. Ohta, J. Math. Phys. **37**, 4693 (1996).
- [10] J. Satsuma, K. Kajiwara, B. Grammaticos, J. Hietarinta and A. Ramani, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen., **28** 3541 (1995).
- [11] K. Kajiwara, K. Yamamoto and Y. Ohta, preprint `solv-int/9702001`.
- [12] K. Kajiwara and Y. Ohta, unpublished
- [13] K.M. Tamizhmani, B. Grammaticos and A. Ramani, Lett. Math. Phys. **29**, 49 (1993).
- [14] A. Bassom and P. Clarkson, Phys. Lett. A **194** 358 (1994); P. Clarkson and A. Bassom, preprint `solv-int/9412002`.
- [15] A.C. Hearn, *REDUCE User's Manual*, v.3.6 ©Rand (1995).